REMARKS

Claims 1-29 and 42-48 are pending in the application. Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 25, 26, 46 and 47 are withdrawn from consideration.

The disclosure is objected to for various informalities, which have been addressed in the Amendments To The Specification on page 2. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

The drawings are objected to because reference numeral 154 is missing and Figure "28AC" should be relabled "28A". Amended drawings were submitted on July 15, 2004 with the required changes. A copy of the filing with return postcard is submitted herewith.

Claims 1-5, 8, 11-24, 27-29, 42-45 and 48 are rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,871,520. Applicant submits herewith a terminal disclaimer, thereby obviating the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 8, 11-24, 27-29, 42-45 and 48 are rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,959,569. Applicant submits herewith a terminal disclaimer, thereby obviating the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 8, 11-24, 27-29, 42-45 and 48 are provisionally rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 10/958,081. Applicant submits herewith a provisional terminal disclaimer, thereby obviating the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 8, 11-24, 27-29, 42-45 and 48 are provisionally rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-21 of copending Application No. 11/011,530. Applicant submits herewith a provisional terminal disclaimer, thereby obviating the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 8, 11-24, 27-29, 42-45 and 48 are provisionally rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of copending Application No. 11/055,284. Applicant submits herewith a provisional terminal disclaimer, thereby obviating the rejection.

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hill (262). Hill does not have means for changing that is configured to move the plurality of racks in the cylinder body parallel to, transversely to, and rotationally about the longitudinal axis of the cylinder body to disengage the racks from the pins. Accordingly, Hill does not anticipate claims 15-17 and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 15-17, 22-24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Loretti (495). With respect to claims 15-17, Loretti does not have means for changing that is configured to move the plurality of racks in the cylinder body parallel to, transversely to, and rotationally about the longitudinal axis of the cylinder body to disengage the racks from the pins. Loretti's racks do not move parallel to the longitudinal axis to disengage from the pins.

With respect to claims 22-24 and 27, Loretti's racks are not configured to disengage from the pins in response to movement in the cylinder body parallel to, transversely to, and rotationally about the longitudinal axis. Loretti's racks do not move parallel to the longitudinal axis to disengage from the pins. Accordingly, Loretti does not anticipate claims 15-17 and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 8, 13-20, 22-24, 27-29, 42-45 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sperber et al. (181).

With respect to claims 1-5 and 11-14, Sperber's carrier sub-assembly 6, 9, 8 is not moveable parallel to the longitudinal axis of the cylinder body between a first position and a second position to disengage the racks from the pins. When Sperber's carrier sub-assembly moves parallel to the longitudinal axis, as illustrated in Figs. 2b and 2c, his spring/fixing element 6 locks the racks and pins together, rather than disengaging them. As discussed at column 6, lines 1-8, once the carrier sub-assembly has moved to the left, as seen in Fig. 2c, it is no longer movable longitudinally to the right because the spring 600 enters the cutout 22.

With respect to claims 15-20, 22-24, 27-29, and 42-45. Sperber's means for changing the lock cylinder between a rekeying condition and an operating conditionis not configured to move the plurality of racks in the cylinder body parallel to, transversely to, and rotationally about the longitudinal axis of the cylinder body to disengage the racks from the pins. Sperber's lock does not rotate to disengage the racks from the pins.

With respect to claim 48, Sperber's lock starts from an uncoded zero position. A valid key is in the lock in the zero condition, thereby coding the lock to the valid key. Once the first valid key is inserted into Sperber's lock, the lock is no longer rekeyable by rotating the lock. As stated at column 6, lines 1-5,

> "...a detent spring 600 can pivot downwardly: this prevents the release of the fixing of the code of the locking core without disassembly of the locking system."

In view of the above comments and claim amendments, applicant submits that Sperber does not anticipate claims 1-5, 8, 11, 13-20, 22-24, 27-29, 42-45 and 48 and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/28/2006

Richard J. Veltman
Reg. No. 36,957